DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 473 TM 017 287

AUTHOR	Rosser, Phyllis; And Others
TITLE	Gender Bias in Testing: Current Debates for Future Priorities. A Public Policy Dialogue. Proceedings of the Ford Foundation Women's Program Forum (2nd, New York, New York, April 1989).
INSTITUTION	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	May 91
NOTE	23p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ford Foundation, Office of Communications, 320 East 43 Street, New York, NY 10017 (free).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; College Entrance Examinations; Culture Fair Tests; Educational Policy; *Females; Higher Education; High Schools; Instructional Materials; Minority Groups; *Research Needs; *Seminars; *Sex Bias; *Standardized Tests; *Test Bias; Testing Problems; Test Results; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS	Forums; *Scholastic Aptitude Test

ABSTRACT

In April 1989, the Women's Program Forum of the Ford Foundation sponsored a seminar that examined the current debates and future directions surrounding the issue of gender bias in testing, with particular attention to the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). This booklet provides a transcript of the proceedings of the forum. P. Rosser's presentation of her research findings on the SAT is included, followed by a panel discussion by the following experts from various areas of education: S. Brown; M. Greenberger; S. Johnson; G. Medalus; M. Welsh; and L. R. Wolfe. The panel points out concerns across a broad spectrum of testing issues, including: (1) ethnic, linguistic, and minority bias, alone and coupled with gender; (2) the impact of standardized testing on classroom instruction and teaching materials; (3) possible consequences of eliminating the SAT; (4) the usefulness of litigation; and (5) the need for more data. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Ford Foundation Women's Program Forum

Tm

GENDER BIAS IN TESTING

CURRENT DEBATES FUTURE PRIORITIES

A public policy dialogue

Phyllis Rosser, *presenter*

Susan Brown

Marcia Greenberger

Sylvia Johnson

George Medaus

Maureen Welsh

Leslie R. Wolfe

ED334743

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CAROLEE ILTIS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM017287

Introduction

In 1986, the Ford Foundation established the Women's Program Forum, a staff group that provides opportunities for grantmakers throughout the donor communities to discuss issues related to women's programs. Over the last four years, the Forum has sponsored two international meetings: one in New York, which examined the "Changing Context for Movements to Improve Women's Lives;" and the second in Nairobi, Kenya, entitled "Expanding Income-Earning Opportunities for Women in Poverty: A Cross-Regional Dialogue." In addition to these events, the Forum also sponsors smaller, more informal bi-monthly seminars at the Foundation's headquarters in New York.

In April 1989, the Forum sponsored a seminar that examined the current debates and future directions surrounding the issue of gender bias in testing, with particular attention to the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). Phyllis Rosser, author of *The SAT Gender Gap*, presented the findings of her research on the SAT. Her presentation was followed by a panel of six experts in various areas of education: Susan Brown, Marcia Greenberger, Sylvia Johnson, George Medaus, Maureen Welsh, and Leslie R. Wolfe.

The panel pointed out concerns across a broad spectrum of testing issues including subjects such as ethnic, linguistic, and minority bias, both by themselves and coupled with gender; the impact of standardized tests on classroom instruction and teaching materials; the possible consequences of eliminating the SAT in college admissions; the usefulness of litigation; and the need for more data. Because we thought that this discussion would be of interest to a wide range of audiences, the transcript has been edited for publication. Program officers Alison Bernstein, Richard

Horovitz, and June Zeitlin were co-chairs of the Women's Program Forum at the time of the seminar. Alison Bernstein, the program officer for education and culture, introduced the discussion.

Susan V. Berresford, Vice President
Program Division
Ford Foundation

Proceedings

BERNSTEIN: My name is Alison Bernstein, and with June Zeitlin and Richard Horovitz, my co-chairs, I'd like to welcome you to the second seminar in the 1989 Ford Foundation Women's Program Forum Seminar Series, the title of which is "Gender Bias in Testing: Current Debates and Future Priorities."

This topic is both timely and familiar. It concerns a renewed and growing debate over the use and misuse of standardized testing to screen, sort, and diagnose student talent, potential, and achievement.

Today's presenter, Phyllis Rosser, has spent the last several years intimately examining the Scholastic Aptitude Test. She is the director of the Equality in Testing Project, and the author of the book, *The SAT Gender Gap: Identifying The Causes.*

Phyllis will be followed by six commentators, each of whom will develop the areas of his or her expertise. They are Susan Brown, director of the Higher Education Program for the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) and Marcia Greenberger, a founder of the National Women's Law Center. Susan and Marcia will talk about the litigation in the field.

Dr. George Medaus, director of the Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy at Boston College, is the staff director of the National Commission on Testing. Dr. Sylvia Johnson is professor and chair of the Department of Psycho-educational Studies of the School of Education at Howard University. George and Sylvia will raise the psychometrician and educational research issues.

Dr. Maureen Welsh is the associate director of Admissions Testing Program of the College Board, and Dr. Leslie R. Wolfe is executive director of the Center for Women Policy Studies. They will talk about education reform.

ROSSER: I discovered that the SAT was having a biased effect against girls in 1979 when I was doing some testing research for Ms. magazine. I looked at different tests, and found that the questions were populated by many more males than females; minorities rarely appeared; and neither women nor minorities were ever shown in a position of power over a white man.

The tests where sex bias was having the greatest impact on girls' educational opportunities were the college admissions tests: the Scholastic Aptitude Test, the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitute Test (PSAT) which is used to pick the National Merit Scholarship pool, and the ACT Assessment test.

Since 1979, I have concentrated my research on the SAT, the most prestigious of these tests and one which is defined as an aptitude test. The SAT has become a public IQ test. Even more than grades, the SAT determines which college a student will aspire to. It is even used by some employers.

The SAT is biased because, despite its declared purpose to predict how well students are going to do in their first college year, it underpredicts women's college performance. Girls get better average grades in high school and in college than boys, but they are receiving lower average scores on the SAT. Unfairly low test scores become a self-fulfilling prophecy, causing girls to lower their expectations and apply to less competitive schools than their grades would suggest. Minority women are doubly penalized. They score lower than the men in their racial groups, who in turn score lower than white men.

Girls and minorities are also denied the opportunity to participate in academic enrichment classes which are offered by talent search programs to seventh through eleventh graders with high SAT scores. Use of these exam scores also means less scholarship money for women, particularly from the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, where only one-third of the scholarship semifinalist pool is female. This underprediction affects girls' chances to gain admission to most of the colleges and universities which require SAT scores, including state universities.

The final result is a real dollar loss for women in later life as they get less prestigious jobs, earn less money, and have fewer leadership opportunities. Their lifelong loss of self-confidence cannot be measured in financial terms.

I received a Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) grant to try to pinpoint the causes of sex bias in standardized testing, particularly in the SAT. This allowed me to do two item analyses of the SAT. My major findings from both of these analyses showed that there were a number of questions with gender differences. When we equalized the verbal score averages by removing those questions that favored males the most and refigured the scores, we found that the girls and boys did equally well.

We found other differences between the sexes as well. Girls were more anxious. We didn't find much of a correlation with their performance, except in math, where the extremely anxious girls scored lower than the moderately anxious girls. This is an area where more research is needed.

Girls were slower on the math test, though not on the verbal test, and they left more math questions blank. There are several possible explanations for this. Girls don't take risks nor do they guess as frequently as boys. They are also more likely to play by the rules than boys. Girls do better on computation questions, worse on math reasoning questions. Since they seem to learn the math as well as boys, they may be more reluctant to apply these rules in an unfamiliar way. All of these problems are interrelated—anxiety, speed, risk taking—and they all deserve further study.

We found that girls had higher grades in English and math, but had lower SAT scores. We expected this would have a negative impact on their self-image, and it did! In one study, we asked both sexes to estimate their abilities. The self-evaluations for both were more in line with their SAT scores than with their grades.

The underprediction for minority females is much more complicated. African-American women scored worse on more than

half the verbal and 80 percent of the math questions, as did Hispanic women. Native American women did worse on 20 of the verbal questions and 28 of the math questions. Asian-American women were somewhat higher than white women on 8 verbal questions, but worse on 24 of the verbal questions. They scored better on nearly all the math questions.

While important research is showing that cognitive differences between the sexes are narrowing, the SAT gender gap is widening.

Where do we go from here? I'd like to see more research on the predictive validity of this test for women and minorities, and particularly for minority women. We need more research on math problem solving styles for males and females, particularly within minority groups. We need to find more equitable ways of evaluating female and minority students, particularly by including areas where they excel.

BROWN: The recent New York District Court opinion in *Sharif** is of immense importance. It is a precedent for test usage and limitations. The Court states that the SAT predicts first year college grades only, and that the testing manufacturers contradict themselves on whether their test is an achievement or an aptitude test.

For a long time, we at MALDEF have been battling against the misuse of the standardized test and its effect on minority groups. Within that ongoing struggle, I was well aware of the virtually perfect correlation between standardized tests and socio-economic status. We are rewarding students of higher socio-economic status based on test scores.

*This case involved a challenge to the awarding of New York State Scholarships based solely on SAT scores. The court found that this policy has a discriminatory impact on women in violation of Title IX (Education Amendments of 1972).

What was accomplished by the *Sharif* case should be expanded to include minority females and, by implication, minority groups in their entirety.

Texas is in the process of instituting the so-called "Rising Junior" test. To go on to junior level status in any Texas college or university, a student must have passed this test by the end of the sophomore year. In theory, one can be excluded from entering junior year on the basis of this test alone.

In California, numerous colleges are using scores from inappropriate tests to decide who gets into transferable courses from community colleges. In California, 85 percent of blacks and Latinos enter universities through the community college system. There are lots of minority women being excluded from higher education in California based on these tests.

These issues are going to have to be litigated because of the impact on minority populations, particularly women. The standardized tests, if allowed to be misused, will permit a sexual, racial, and ethnic caste system that we must challenge.

GREENBERGER: We are seeing curriculum designed to reflect success in these tests. I want to know whether these tests have an impact on what people are taught. I don't think we know what effect the major tests have in terms of their gender differential. I don't think we know their effects on counseling and the steering that may result. These haven't been documented yet.

One of the key pieces of information we need is a breakdown of statistics by gender and race, and by gender and by ethnicity. Until that kind of research is developed it is very difficult to pinpoint the nature of all the problems that we need to confront.

We need to look very closely at what the tests are supposed to be measuring, i.e., their intended usage as described by those who develop them. As we've seen with the SATs, the stated purpose bears little relationship to the actual uses to which the tests are being put.

One of the key issues is how to encourage this research

and its answers, and what we do while the research is being conducted.

There are significant legal questions concerning where the burdens should be placed. Should they be placed on advocates, or on the female minorities who suffer with the differentials? Or should the burden be placed on those who are using and developing the tests?

We have a series of laws in place, like Title IX and Title VII, which say that when there is a differential on the basis of gender or minority status, the burden to justify the continued use should be placed on those who want to perpetuate the use of measurements that result in that differential.

BERNSTEIN: Isabelle Pinzler, the litigator who brought the *Sharif* case, is here. Isabelle, would you want to say a few words before we open this part of the discussion?

PINZLER: I think we need to develop legal theories that deal with the combination of race-and-gender discrimination, and ethnicity-and-gender discrimination.

We struggled with race and ethnicity when we first planned the lawsuit, and decided, because we knew this was going to be the first case in which testing standards would be applied to Title IX, that we would do the cautious thing, and bring it just on the basis of sex. We knew what was happening to males and females. We did not know how it was being broken down by race.

BERNSTEIN: Did you have any *amicus curiae* briefs that were filed on behalf of the *Sharif* case, and what did the College Board say with regard to this?

PINZLER: The College Board and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) filed an *amicus* brief. They said that we were wrong on the law. They said the test, when properly used, is not gender

discriminatory. What they didn't point out was that in the *Sharif* case, the test was being used alone and not as a predictor.

AUDIENCE: We should keep in mind the broader use of law than litigation. Legislatures and agencies can be helpful in requiring release of data that may not be accessible to private researchers.

GREENBERGER: The Office for Civil Rights is looking at the use of vocational tests in the public schools. We've been trying to get information from that agency to see the data on which they were basing their conclusions. To get some of the data is difficult, short of litigation. Yet, without the data, it is difficult to bring litigation.

WOLFE: We recommend that not only more research should be done, but that some light should be shining on that data. ETS needs to make known its own studies. There's been a real lack of information made available to the public. A lot of work in the future will be to get the public more knowledgeable about the testing.

PANELIST: Educational Testing Service has been doing papers forever, and they are quite happy to continue doing them. What they won't do is sanction somebody who is misusing the test.

PANELIST: I notice a difference between employment testing validation and education testing validation. There's a certain circularity in the validation of educational testing that doesn't arise in the employment field.

PANELIST: But there's a very disturbing trend emerging out of employment licensing and certification decisions. They're not tying those tests to job performance. They're tying them to analysis content capacity.

PANELIST: A trend in this country is to look at manufacturers and service agencies in terms of their liability in relation to use of product. This trend has never been pushed in testing.

MEDAUS: This is a marvelous wedge for looking at bias in testing in general. It's much more difficult for people to explain away gender differences in tests than it is for them to explain racial minority differences. People are willing to look at it in terms of gender bias. They are not as willing to look at it in terms of race or linguistic differences.

What we need is much more information on how tests are affecting males and females and people of color, at a much earlier stage, particularly now that they push tests all the way down to preschool. We called a friend who has run the Kansas state testing program, and asked him about gender differences. He said that basically there were no differences until the eighth grade, and then the girls hit the wall. He said that for about six years they've been trying to figure out what's going on.

These tests are becoming so important in schools that they are becoming ends in themselves. Because teachers prepare students for the test, a whole new industry of test preparation material has grown up. Now, if there are gender differences and racial differences, and the instructional material is geared toward selection, instruction itself may be biased toward different groups.

One of the biggest needs right now is research concerning why people answer items the way they do. A colleague of ours took the most popularly used achievement test in elementary school and had a very small sample of kids talk aloud as they answered questions. He found that kids were getting the wrong answer for very good reasons. We don't know why different groups of people answer items the way they do. We need to know a lot about that, and this is something that psychometricians are not trained to do.

In the long term, this bias is going to be a value problem, a

fairness problem. It is very easy to build a legally defensible test and get it through the courts today. There are a growing number of women working within the psychometric community. That is not true for people of color. We need many more people of color trained so they know how to talk to psychometricians.

JOHNSON: I think all the motivational characteristics need to be looked at carefully because it is not just a psychometric problem, it is a policy issue. What is it that African-American women, or Hispanic women, or women in general do that may affect their performance? The whole issue of income differences is highly confounded here. When we look at gender within minority groups, it certainly is confounded with income levels.

We need to think carefully about what goes into college performance. Perhaps women are more successful than men in terms of the complex matrix of personal motivations in getting through the first year. The test score may simply not be as important in terms of their performance.

Do we want a test that is more predictive for women? Would it then be less predictive for men? Do we want a test that's more predictive for African Americans? Would it be less predictive for the majority? When we look at the criteria, we have to realize that improving tests may actually lower their predictive power. Essentially, in a less than fair system of education, instruments that mirror the unfairness may be more predictive of performance than fairer testing can be. If we consider test items that have biases against women, and consider women in co-ed schools with significant anti-feminine achievement values, then performance on the kinds of test items will show a correlation with success in such a system.

AUDIENCE: There is another whole field of research which is beginning to develop instruments and ways of looking directly at the thinking the children are doing. This version of assessment is

in development right now and it will be developed with gender and racial biases built in if we don't watch it.

PANELIST: We haven't designed alternatives that we can present easily and cleanly to a court or to a policy maker.

MEDAUS: That's one of the reasons why I said it isn't primarily a technical issue. It's a validity problem, and validity is a scientific concept. In its best sense, it tries to get at the meaning of a test score.

The validity issue is very discouraging; real validation isn't done. Real validation is an ongoing additive process. It never stops. Can you imagine a commercial company thinking that way? Can you imagine a state agency giving a company money to continue validation?

AUDIENCE: There are a lot of other issues that we should be looking at besides test/educational inequity. There is different treatment in the classroom.

WOLFE: When we talk about this publicly, people always ask the burning question, "Is it the fault of the test, or is it the fault of sexism in the schools?" If, in fact, boys and girls in school—African-American, white, Asian, Native American and Hispanic—learn different skills, absorb different knowledge, and have different learning styles, and if all this is sexism and racism in its most perfect form, why do we have a test that tests for the skills, knowledge, and experiences that are valued in society for white, male, middle-class children?

I think we're trying to set the issue of standardized testing within a context. We are testing for skills that we no longer value. We're testing for speed, facility, risk taking, guessing, and that sort of thing. What we need to look at, when we look at alternatives, is how we assess and measure those skills that we now say we *do* value.

WELSH: A lot has already happened to raise the level of aspiration of young women, to help them develop their talents and abilities and to recognize and reward their achievements. But not enough has happened.

There is a very delicate balance involved in increasing excellence, diversity, and opportunity. Sometimes, our efforts to increase excellence have a negative impact upon opportunity and diversity. We need to be very careful to develop efforts to encourage high standards, but not to develop them in such a way that we prevent women from participating.

Men and women score differently on tests. That may be because of the tests, but it may also be because the characteristics of young women are not the same as the characteristics of young men. The girls who take the SAT are more likely to be members of minority groups. The average woman who takes the SAT comes from a family who has lower parental educational roles and a lower family income than the average young man. She is more likely to be the first generation to attend college.

We need to convince women that they need to take the right courses to develop the right competencies. We need to give them some opportunities to experience accomplishment. And finally, I think we need to be careful not to get so involved in trying to enable women to get into the boxes that are already out there. We want to help women create their own opportunities, and not just ask for room in a box.

WOLFE: It's very important to note and to repeat that the girls and young women who are the most penalized by low SAT scores are the girls with the highest grades. When we compare girls and boys within the highest income group, students from families earning $70,000 a year or more, there is still a substantial gender gap. We've all said over the years that socio-economic status has an impact on SAT scores, but for girls the facts are different.

On the math SAT, the girls with family earnings of $70,000-plus are at about the same score level as the boys from families

earning between $40,000 and $50,000. Within every racial and ethnic group, the girls are scoring lower. The racial-ethnic gap is enormous, and within that, women are the most disadvantaged.

We have also found that girls who have taken the same courses as boys—pre-calculus, calculus, advanced algebra—in the same classrooms, with the same teachers were, in fact, getting lower scores. Higher grades, same classroom, same courses, but lower SAT scores. There is something going on in those tests.

We're talking about four parallel tracks of activity which need to be undertaken. The first is the legal track. The second is public education. We have to inform ourselves and the consumers—those who are affected by the SAT and other standardized tests—about test meaning, test impact, and the potential of the consumer in making changes.

The third is the need for additional research. I believe that we must use this moment in the education reform movement to restore concern for equity and to generate adequate funds for examining the context of bias. We need to look at the connections between bias in the classroom, bias in the textbooks, and bias in the tests. This is not to say that the tests should get off the hook for reflecting sexism and racism.

The way in which we value certain subjects and certain skills is extremely important. We know that these tests are not assessing much of the learning and thinking that we are supposed to be valuing. There is a need for a much more complicated response than ETS's statement that "unequal education produces unequal test results." And I would like to see some research on coaching. It does work.

Finally, at the Center for Women Policy Studies, we believe it is most important to look at the need for policy change. We have enough data, enough evidence, enough doubt about the uses of the SAT and other standardized tests to suggest institutional policy changes.

I would like you to bring all of the top college admissions officers around this table and then we could have a conversation

about the uses of the test and the value of the SAT as a predictor. I would like to see us develop some policy recommendations from the whole educational system. I would like to see us do this again—sit down from all of our different perspectives and develop the kind of measurements of student achievement, teacher achievement, school achievement, and success that would not be biased and that would get at the complexities of the issues.

One of the key pieces of the ETS New Possibilities project is market research. We are the market, and I think the equity issues and the elimination of bias by race and by sex are very key ones for market research.

PANELIST: I like the idea of locking the admissions officers in this room, but I don't think they should be locked in alone. We need to build some better partnerships to resolve problems. The College Board and ETS need to be part of this partnership because they need to serve their clients. The consumers, the college admissions officers, need to be part of this partnership as do those of you because you have daughters.

I hear stories from people whose daughters are clearly in the category that got to an Ivy League school and have taken the SAT four and five times, after many, many coaching courses regardless of their straight A grades, because of fear.

AUDIENCE: If you're going to talk about eliminating the SAT, you'd better find out what they're going to do instead. Most college admissions officers have profiles on various high schools and they know how well the students from particular high schools do in their institutions. In fact, they count on that factor a great deal when balanced against the grade point average and the SAT. One admissions officer said that the only time he considers the SAT score is when he is getting an applicant from a high school for the first time.

What this is going to do, of course, is give preference to kids coming from—shall I name the schools? How do you think those kids got into those schools in the first place? Because they test well.

That might be the way a tough set of admissions people would look at it, but there is a whole range of colleges and state universities that have quantities of people, but don't have the resources in their admissions staffs to do that kind of in-depth work with high schools.

If something like dropping the SAT were tried, there would need to be a group to work on alternatives. How are admissions staffs going to go about the process of evaluating people if, in fact, this particular instrument is not part of the show?

WELSH: If there were no SAT, that would put more weight on the secondary school "to describe itself" in the preparation of its students. That might result in already advantaged youngsters excelling in admissions at the expense of poor, urban, rural, minority students. There's always the danger that what follows is a vacuum.

AUDIENCE: We've been talking about what would happen if we dropped SAT scores. What about the schools that have done it? We've got a little history anyway. What have they done differently in their admissions? Have more women, blacks, or Hispanics been admitted?

PANELIST: I suspect this had to do with self-image. People who didn't apply to places before are willing to jump now that this hurdle is down.

JOHNSON: I would rather you look at what is happening in elementary and secondary schools which is leading to inequity among a lot of groups. I am worried about women versus men here, not only in fairness or unfairness in test scores, but in the broader context of what we're doing to our kids. There are root

problems that go beyond the issue of bias in testing that we have to worry about.

AUDIENCE: I think the discussion is important because it concerns race-and-gender and ethnicity-and-gender together. You're suggesting that we try to find solutions that are going to resolve problems for all these different groups, without suggesting that there's one solution for everybody, or that the solution is simple.

JOHNSON: I am concerned about the preparation of kids for college as well as the relationship of that preparation to test performance. I recognize that there are inadequacies in the measurement, but also recognize that there are students scoring lower because they are getting less in terms of preparation.

We want to remove bias from the test, not just for its own sake, but to produce greater access and greater involvement among the larger society after college. Simply removing the test isn't going to do it. We need to look at the system more broadly and see what needs to be done to adequately prepare young people from diverse backgrounds for college.

GREENBERGER: It would be very intriguing to hear the response of the decision makers as to why it's important to retain the SATs; to really pin them down on exactly what they need them for. A second concern is about the curriculum being driven more and more by tests which we have no confidence in to begin with.

BROWN: I am not worried about taking away the test scores. I think you'll have the same net result with or without them. UCLA and Berkeley have their admissions by zip code now. Students from the most affluent high schools are the ones that end up at UCLA and Berkeley.

Litigation, blunt as it is, is absolutely necessary. We can't wait ten years for additional research to decide what to do in

Texas when we face 50 percent of the Third World students being excluded in their junior year.

PANELIST: Most state departments of education in this country do not collect data by race; they have data by gender. If we could get the commissioners in a room and get them to move their departments to get that data, I think that would help us in the long run.

AUDIENCE: It's very important for people to understand that the tests are not an IQ score. Educating the public on that point is vital.

PANELIST: If we could just get the College Board to enforce its guidelines on the use of the test, not permitting scores to be used for purposes other than that for which they were validated, we would make a lot of headway.

MEDAUS: Some companies could not afford to say, "You can't use the test this way." There's too much money involved. There is also no regulation on monitoring the testing industry. Carnegie and Ford have given Boston College a grant for a feasibility study to look at various regulatory models and whether or not they could be applied to the testing industry. The bias right now is toward a non-governmental, independent kind of agency.

AUDIENCE: My question about an independent monitoring agency is what is its power and what is its authority?

PANELIST: There are some interesting federal policy issues there. There is a lot of federal money there. There are hooks which can be used beyond litigation.

I think that it is absolutely vital that we focus on increasing the amount of information we have because, otherwise, we could

always be accused of speaking out of our own biases instead of from statistics and facts.

AUDIENCE: Too often, we all get to a position where we are looking at a test as an end in itself, and looking at education as an end in itself, and neither of those two things is true. When I was doing admissions work, I was very taken with some of the early research that ACT did that found that the best predictor of success and happiness in life is participation and success in high school activities. What we are doing is trying to help a cohort of young people move progressively through life, through the educational process.

To put it simplistically, the measure of a good education is a successful, happy life.

Afterword

One of the goals of the Ford Foundation's Women's Program Forum is to help funders explore the critical issues affecting women that researchers, activists, and policy makers will confront in the decades ahead. Seminars like "Gender Bias in Testing" can help donors reflect and strategize on programming challenges in standardized testing, teaching materials, and education.

We take away from this session an increased appreciation of the range and complexities of the problems facing young women and minorities in their efforts to obtain a quality education. Gender and ethnic biases are not only found in testing, they permeate classrooms and textbooks as well. We need to identify the sources of bias at their roots. We need to continue looking for the origins of such bias in primary education. We need to support litigation that attempts to restrict the use of tests which deny access to higher education to minorities and women. We need to investigate how women and minorities test and how they learn. We need to assist administrators in finding genuinely humane forms of evaluation as alternatives to the current measurements for college admissions. And, most importantly, we need to help develop the data on which to base quality alternatives. As donors, we can work in these many areas to ensure that talented students are not deprived of the education they deserve because they happen to be female or minority.

Alison Bernstein, Co-Chair
Women's Program Forum

Additional copies of this pamphlet, as well as
a complete list of publications, may be obtained
from the Foundation's Office of Communications,
320 East 43 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

494 May 1991